UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON AT TACOMA

KELLY H. WATSON and MARK R. WATSON, wife and husband,

VS.

AMERICAN HOME MORTGAGE

ACCEPTANCE, INC., a New York

DOE" MILLER, and TRAVELERS

AMERICA, Bond No. 104574505,

Corporation; LIANA MILLER AND "JOHN

CASUALTY AND SURETY COMPANY OF

Defendants.

Plaintiff,

NO.

10 11

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21 22

23

24 25

26

[1435983 v02.doc]

COMPLAINT FOR CONSUMER PROTECTION ACT VIOLATIONS, FRAUD AND CLAIM AGAINST CONSUMER LOAN ACT BOND

AND JURY DEMAND

Plaintiffs allege as follows:

- Plaintiffs Kelly and Mark Watson reside in Pierce County, Washington. The 1. real property that secured Plaintiffs' consumer mortgage issued by Defendant American Home Mortgage Acceptance, Inc. is located in Pierce County, Washington.
- 2. Defendant American Home Mortgage, Acceptance Inc. ("AHMA", is a New York corporation that at all relevant times was doing business in Pierce County Washington.

Complaint - 1 of 7

AHMA was registered to do business in the State of Washington and was licensed by the State of Washington Department of Financial Institutions as a consumer lender, operating under license number 520-CL-28495.

- 3. Defendant Liana Miller is married to "John Doe" Miller and resides in Las Vegas, Nevada. Liana Miller represented herself as "Senior Mortgage Broker" who was an agent and authorized representative of Defendant AHMA, and she solicited Plaintiffs in Gig Harbor, Washington, to obtain a mortgage through AHMA. Defendant Miller's actions were on behalf of and intended to benefit her marital community.
- 4. Defendant Travelers Casualty and Surety Company of America, is a foreign insurer authorized to do business in Washington, who furnished AHMA with Bond No. 104574505 in the amount of \$400,000.00, under Chapter 31.04, RCW, the Consumer Lending Act. This Consumer Loan Bond was issued on July 19, 2005 and remained in effect through July 19, 2007. A copy of the Bond and related extension documents are attached hereto as **Exhibit A** and incorporated by reference.
- 5. The amount in dispute in this matter is in excess of \$75,000, exclusive of interest and costs.
- 6. The Court has subject matter jurisdiction over this matter pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1332(a).
- 7. This court has personal jurisdiction over Defendants in accord with RCW 4.28.185 due to Defendants' transaction of business in this State and because Defendant AHMA and Defendant Miller engaged in tortious conduct within the State of Washington and expressly directed at Plaintiffs, who are Washington residents.

Complaint - 2 of 7

[1435983 v02.doc]

- 8. Venue of this matter is appropriate in this Court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(a), because the real property that secured the loan at issue is situated in Pierce County and the tortious acts underlying these claim occurred in Pierce County.
- 9. In 2007 AHMA's parent corporation filed a Chapter 11 Bankruptcy proceeding in the Bankruptcy Court in the District of Delaware. As a result, any action against AHMA was stayed by the bankruptcy. On July 25, 2008, Plaintiffs obtained an order from the Bankruptcy Court authorizing relief from the stay to pursue claims against AHMA so long as any recovery was sought from the proceeds of the bond and not from the assets of AHMA. A copy of the Bankruptcy Court's order is attached hereto as **Exhibit B** and incorporated by reference.
- 10. From April 30, 2006 through approximately June 5, 2006, Defendant AHMA, through its authorized representative, Defendant Liana Miller and others:
 - Provided Plaintiffs with false, deceptive and misleading information relating to the terms of their loan;
 - Failed to provide Plaintiffs with a Good Faith Estimate disclosure or Truth in Lending disclosure within three business days of receiving Plaintiffs' application as required by RCW 31.04.102;
 - Delayed closing Plaintiffs loan causing Plaintiffs to receive less favorable terms than promised.
 - Originated Plaintiffs' loan from a branch office that had never been granted a license by the Washington Department of Financial Institutions; and
 - Failed to maintain records relating to Plaintiffs' loan as required by law.
- 11. Following Plaintiffs' complaints to the Washington State Department of Financial Institutions, an investigation into this matter occurred. At the conclusion of the investigation the investigator found 8 violation of Washington's Consumer Loan Act and

Complaint - 3 of 7

[1435983 v02.doc]

6

8

13 14

15 16

17 18

19

20

21

22 23

24

25

26

made related factual determinations in Plaintiffs' favor. A copy of the Resolution and Closure of the Complaint is attached hereto as **Exhibit C** and incorporated by reference.

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION (CONSUMER LOAN ACT/CONSUMER PROTECTION ACT VIOLATIONS)

- Defendants' improper and deceptive actions are in violation of Washington's 12. Consumer Loan Act, RCW 31.04.27.
- 13. Violations of the Consumer Loan Act are "per se" violations of Washington's Consumer Protection Act (RCW Chapter 19.86), and constitute unfair and deceptive practices as a matter of law that are in violation of the public interest as provided by RCW 31.04.208.
- 14. As a result of Defendants' wrongful and deceptive conduct, Plaintiffs have sustained significant damages to their business and property including increased interest costs, refinancing costs, harm to their business and property, along with accrued interest and attorneys' fees and costs incurred in pursuing this action.

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION (FRAUD)

- 15. As alleged above, Defendant Miller made multiple false and misleading representations to Plaintiffs to convince them not to go forward with the mortgage loan they had previously arranged with East Bay Mortgage. These false and misleading representations included:
 - (a) The AHMA loan would have a more favorable interest rate than what had been offered by East Bay Mortgage.

Complaint - 4 of 7

[1435983 v02.doc]

- (b) The AHMA loan would be a 5/1 Adjustable Rate Mortgage, with the interest rate is locked in for five years and payments are set at 1% interest only for the first five years of the loan; and
- (c) The AHMA loan would have an 80% loan-to-value ratio;
- 16. At the time Miller made these false statements to Plaintiffs, she was acting as agent for and for the financial benefit of her principal AHMA and herself.
- 17. At the time Miller made these statements to Plaintiffs, it was to induce them to cancel their loan with East Bay Mortgage and to instead obtain a loan through her with AHMA.
- 18. At the time Miller made these statements to Plaintiffs, she knew or should have known, that they were substantially false and misleading.
- 19. Miller made these false and misleading statements to Plaintiffs with the specific intent to convince them to obtain a loan through AHMA.
- 20. Plaintiffs reasonably relied upon Miller's statements in choosing to stop proceeding forward with the loan through East Bay Mortgage and switch to a loan offered by AHMA.
- 21. The loan AHMA ultimately provided to Plaintiffs was at a significantly higher interest rate that what they had arranged through East Bay Mortgage, was not a 5/1 ARM, was not the promised 80% loan-to-value ratio, and had substantial prepayment penalties.
- 22. As a direct and foreseeable result of Defendant Miller and Defendant AHMA's fraudulent actions, Plaintiffs suffered damages in an amount to be proven at trial, including damages to their business and property and substantial emotional distress as a result of the

Complaint - 5 of 7

[1435983 v02.doc]

[1435983 v02.doc]

precarious financial position into which they were placed as a result of Defendants fraudulent conduct including mental anguish, anxiety, emotional distress and loss of enjoyment of life.

THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION (CLAIMS AGAINST CONSUMER LOAN BOND)

- 23. Defendant AHMA was a duly licensed Consumer Lender under the provisions of Chapter 31.04, RCW. In accord with the requirements of RCW 31.04.045, Defendant AHMA filed with the Department of Financial Institutions a surety bond in the sum of \$400,000.00, which was provided by Defendant Travelers Casualty and Surety Company of America in the amount of \$400,000.00 under bond number 104574505. This bond is to benefit any persons who may have a cause of action against the lender under Washington's Consumer Loan Act (RCW Chapter 31.04).
- 24. Upon information and belief, there are no claims against Consumer Loan Bond number 104574505 that have priority over Plaintiffs' claims against this bond, and specifically claims by the State of Washington for unpaid assessments do not have priority over Plaintiffs' claims upon bond number 104574505.
- 25. Defendant AHMA is liable to Plaintiffs for damages to their business and property that resulted from AHMA's numerous actions in violation of Washington's Consumer Loan Act, RCW Chapter 31.04. Travelers Casualty and Surety Company of America is liable to Plaintiffs for the amount owed to Plaintiffs by Defendant AHMA up to, but not to exceed, the amount of available bond proceeds of \$400,000.

WHEREFORE Plaintiffs pray for relief as follows:

1. For a principal judgment against Defendant AHMA for damages in an amount to be proven at trial;

Complaint - 6 of 7

- 2. Pre-judgment interest at the maximum allowable rate;
- 3. Reasonable attorney's fees, expenses and costs of suit as allowed by RCW 19.86.090;
 - 4. Treble damages (up to \$10,000) as authorized by RCW 19.86.090;
- 5. An award in the amount of damages against Travelers Casualty and Surety Company of American for all damages proved at trial, plus prejudgment interest and attorney's fees and costs, but not to exceed \$400,000, the available proceeds under Travelers American Casualty and Surety Company of America, Bond No. 104574505; and
- 6. For such other relief in Plaintiffs' favor as the court deems just and equitable under the circumstances.

JURY DEMAND

Plaintiffs hereby request a trial by jury on all matters appropriate to jury decision.

Dated this ______day of February, 2009.

GORDON, THOMAS, HONEYWELL, MALANCA, PETERSON & DAHEIM LLP

Stephanie Bloomfield, WSBA No. 24251

sbloomfield@gth-law.com Attorneys for Plaintiffs

Complaint - 7 of 7

[1435983 v02.doc]

BOND NO. 104574505

corporation of the State of New Yor	PRESENTS, That «American Home Mortgage Acceptance, Inc., a
(if a partnership, give full name and a	ddress of each partner and add the words trading under the firm name and style
State of ".) with place of b	," or if a corporation, insert full title and add the words "a corporation of the usiness at 538 Broadhollow Road, City of Melville County of Suffolk in the
State of New York as principal and I	TRAVELERS CASUALTY AND SURETY COMPANY OF AMERICA, a serve business in the State of W. H.
corporation, authorized to transact sur	rety business in the State of Washington, as surety, are held and firmly bound
ourselves, our heirs, executors, admini	strators, successors and assigns, jointly and severally firmly by these presents.
THE CONDITIONS of the	above obligation are such that: Whereas, the above bounden principal has
Washington, known as the "CONSUM	ER LOAN ACT" of the State of Washington, and acts amendatory thereto.
Now, Therefore, If the said at	pove bounden principal, shall, upon the issuance of said license as aforesaid,
this obligation to be void: otherwise to	remain in full force and effect.
Provided , That the total liabilit	y hereunder arising during the period for which this bond is written shall not
The bally, Imp bolly may	DE CAUCETED DV OTUDO TORISTON NOTICE LA LA LA D
and a more receipt of sa	JU HOBGE H THE DODG TO CONACTOR ASSESSMENT A TOTAL A T
penal sum, or any portion thereof, at two for any or all claims.	o or more points in time be added together in determining the surety's liability
In Witness Whereof, The said hese presents to be signed by its duly 19th Day of July, 2005.	principal has hereunto set his hand and seal and the said surely has caused authorized officers and its corporate seal to be hereto affixed on this day of
	ς _α . • / Χ α.
	Find March Sent
	«American Home Mortgage Acceptance, Inc.
	PRONO AL
•	\bigcap
	By
	By <u>Alan Horn</u>
	TO AVET THE CLASSIAT THE AREA
Surety Corporate Seal)	TRAVELERS CASUALTY AND SURETY COMPANY OF AMERICA
, 164 ** **	By Jewold a. Rosenblu
	JERROLD A. ROSENBLUM, ATTORNEY-IN-FACT
	EXHIBIT A



American Home Mortgage

538 Broadhollow Road • Melville, NY 11747

Christine Berti Licensing Specialist

Phone: (631) 622-6479 Fax: (866) 549-6992

Email: Christine.berti@americanhm.com

June 29, 2006

VIA OVERNIGHT MAIL

Department of Financial Institutions 150 Israel Road SW Tumwater, WA 98501

Re: American Home Mortgage Acceptance, Inc. Continuation Certificate Bond Number 104574505

For License 520-CL-28495

Dear Sir or Madam:

Enclosed please find the following:

1- A continuation certificate for bond number 104574505 extending the bond to July 19, 2007 for license number 520-CL-28495.

If you require any additional information or have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me at the telephone number or email listed above. Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Christine Berti

RECEIVED

JUN 3 0 2006

Licensed Mortgage Banker

DEPT. OF FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS OLYMPIA, WASHINGTON



Travelers Casualty and Surety Company of America Hartford, Connecticut 06183

CONTINUATION CERTIFICATE FIDELITY OR SURETY BONDS/POLICIES

In Consideration of Four Thousand and 00/100 (\$4,000.00) DOLLARS renewal premium,

the term of Bond/Policy No. 104574505 in the amount of \$400,000.00

on behalf of American Home Mortgage Acceptance, Inc. whose address is 538 Broadhollow Road, Melville, NY 11747

in favor of State of WASHINGTON-Department of Financial Institutions, whose address is PO Box 41200, Olympia, WA 98504

in connection with Consumer Loan Bond

is hereby extended to July 19, 2007, subject to all the covenants and conditions of said bond/policy.

This certificate is designed to extend only the life of the bond/policy. It does not increase the amount which may be payable thereunder. The aggregate liability of the Company under the said bond/policy together with this certificate shall be exactly the same as, and no greater than it would have been, if the said bond/policy had originally been written to expire on the date to which it is now being extended.

Signed, sealed and dated June 22, 2006

Travelers Casualty and Surety Company Company of America

Jerrold A. Rosenblum, Attorney-in-Fact

RECEIVED

JUN 3 0 2006

DEPT. OF FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS
OLYMPIA, WASHINGTON



Travelers Casualty and Surety Company of America Hartford, CT 06183

Date: April 11, 2007

STATE OF WASHINGTON DEPARTMENT OF FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS P.O. Box 41200 OLYMPIA, WA 985041200 Office at: 485 Lexington Ave, NEW YORK, NY

10017

CANCELLATION NOTICE		License No.	
RE: AMERICAN HOME MORTGAGE ACCEP 538 BROADHOLLOW ROAD	TANCE, INC., A C	ORPORATION OF THE STA	TE OF NEW YC
MELVILLE, NY 11747	CL 1±	28495	
Bond No. <u>104574505</u>			
Former Bond No.			
Type of Bond/Policy: Small Loan Companie	es		
You are hereby notified that this Company elec-		bove captioned bond require	d by the
STATE OF WASHINGTON		_	•
This cancellation is to take effect onJuly 19, 2	007, in accorda	nce with the terms of said Bor	nd or Policy.

Travelers Casualty and Surety Company of America

By:

Attorney-in-Fact

RECEIVED

APR 18 2007

Rev. 2/05

F-129-P (8/00)

DEPT. OF FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS OLYMPIA, WASHINGTON

IN THE UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT IN AND FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE

In re:)	
AMERICAN HOME MORTGAGE	,)	Chapter 11
HOLDINGS, INC., a Delaware corporation, et. al.,	- į)	Case Number 07-11047 (CSS)
	13	976 W
Debtors.	\mathbb{R}^{n}) Re: Docket No. 4781

ORDER GRANTING MOTION FOR RELIEF FROM THE AUTOMATIC STAY

Upon the motion (the "Motion") of Mark Watson and Kelly Watson ("Movants"), for relief from the automatic stay; and adequate notice of the Motion having been given; and this Court being fully advised in the premises:

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the Motion is GRANTED;

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the automatic stay imposed by Section 362 of the Bankruptcy Code is modified in order to permit Movants to initiate their claims against the Debtor (as defined in the Motion); and

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Movants may not pursue the Debtor for any judgment in their favor without first seeking a further modification of the automatic stay, except as might be permitted by existing and future orders of this Court (including, but not limited to, any plan or plans of reorganization which may be confirmed in the above-captioned bankruptcy cases).

Dated: July 25, 2008

The Honorable Christopher S. Sontchi United States Bankruptcy Judge

STATE OF WASHINGTON DEPARTMENT OF FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS DIVISION OF CONSUMER SERVICES

IN THE MATTER OF INVESTIGATING A COMPLAINT FILED UNDER THE CONSUMER LOAN ACT:

BY:

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

Kelly Watson; Mark Watson

AGAINST: American Home Mortgage Corp

Respondent(s).

Complainant(s),

COMPLAINT NO. 25559

DOCUMENT CLIII THE DEPARTMENT'S RESOLUTION AND CLOSURE OF COMPLAINT

As you were previously informed, a complaint was filed against Respondent under chapter 31.04 RCW, the Consumer Loan Act (the Act). Complainants alleged that the Respondent did not provide a Good Faith Estimate disclosure or Truth in Lending disclosure within three business days of receiving the Complainants' application. Complainant's also alleged that Respondent gave them false and deceptive information related to the interest rates related to their loan. Complainants further alleged that Respondent delayed the closing of the loan, resulting in the Complainants not receiving the originally

The Department of Financial Institutions Division of Consumer Services, under the authority of RCW 31.04.145, conducted a limited scope investigation into this matter. Based upon its investigation and the documentation and

- 1. RCW 31.04.027(1): Employed, directly or indirectly, a scheme, device, or artifice to defraud or mislead.
- 2. RCW 31.04.027(2): Engaged, directly or indirectly, in an unfair or deceptive practice.
- 3. RCW 31.04.027(6): Failed to make disclosures to loan applicants as required by RCW 31.04.102 and any other
- 4. RCW 31.04.027(7): Made false or deceptive statements or representations regarding the rates, points, or other financing terms or conditions.
- 5. RCW 31.04.075: Failed to obtain and maintain appropriate licenses; unlicensed branch location.
- 6. RCW 31.04.102(2): Failed to make written disclosure within three business days following receipt of a loan
- 7. RCW 31.04.102(3): Failed to provide borrower, within three business days of receipt of a loan application, with an estimated APR and disclosure of whether there is a prepayment penalty. 8. RCW 31.04.155: Failed to comply with record keeping requirements of this section.

Based upon the above findings and apparent violations, the Department makes the following determination:

To the Respondent: The Complainants alleged that Respondent provided false and misleading information related to loan terms to lure the Complainants from a competitor with which Complainants were obtaining a loan. Complainants further alleged that Respondent thereafter did not provide the promised loan terms. Respondent was given the opportunity to respond to these allegations and did not deny them. Consequently, the Department accepts them as a verity. Respondent's conduct violated RCW 31.04.027 (1), (2), and (7).

Complainants also alleged that Respondent did not provide a Good Faith Estimate disclosure or Truth in Lending Disclosure within three business days of receiving the Complainants' loan application. Respondent replied that it received the Complainant's application on May 8, 2006, and sent out the disclosures the same day. Complainants, however, have provided the Department with a copy of an email they received from Respondent on May 1, 2006, acknowledging receipt of the Complainants' application. Based upon this evidence, Respondent clearly violated RCW 31.04.027(6), RCW 31.04.102(2) and (3), the Real Estate Settlement Procedures Act, and the Truth in Lending Act. Failure to timely make mandatory disclosures is also a deceptive practice in violation of RCW

EXHIBIT

In reviewing the loan application for this loan, the Department has determined that the loan was originated by a branch office located at 777 North Rainbow Blvd., Ste. 345, Las Vegas, Nevada. Respondent, however, has never been granted a license for that location. Consequently, Respondent is in violation of RCW 31.04.075.

Finally, as part of its investigation of the Complainant's allegations, the Department issued a Directive to Respondent requiring Respondent to provide a copy of the entire loan file for the Complainants' loan. The documents Respondent provided, however, did not include several documents Respondent was required to maintain; most notably the Notes, the Deed of Trust, and the Final HUD 1 Settlement Statement. This is either a violation of RCW 31.04.145 for failing to respond completely with a Directive from the Director, or a violation of RCW 31.04.155 for failing to maintain records in such a manner as to enable the Department to determine whether Respondent is complying with the Act. Based upon Respondent's current status related to its bankruptcy, the Department has determined the latter.

To the Complainant: The Department has found numerous violations of the Act and, under normal circumstances, would request remedial action by the Respondent that would include a refund of all fees Respondent received for this loan. Unfortunately, Respondent's ongoing Chapter 11 bankruptcy proceedings prevent the Department from requesting any financial payments. Additionally, Respondent has surrendered its Washington licenses, rendering any other remedial corrective action moot. Finally, the Department is without authority to require Respondent to recast your loan. You may wish to consult with a private attorney.

Respondent is expected to implement a system of controls designed to prevent future violations of the Act. The Department will review Respondent's efforts during Respondent's next examination to ensure compliance with the Act.

Accordingly, this Resolution and Closure of Complaint serves as notice that this complaint filed against Respondent is closed. However, the Department of Financial Institutions Division of Consumer Services retains the authority to reopen this complaint in the event that subsequent information comes to our attention relevant to this matter.

Kelly Watson; Mark Watson

l

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

-1-8

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

Dated: Tuesday, March 18, 2008



Steven C. Sherman Financial Legal Examiner